

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Enclosed are replacement sheets for Figures 1-7, 9, 11, 13-16, 18-25. The replacement sheets include the freehand corrections previously submitted. No new matter is entered.

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are pending in the application.

Claims 9, 12-22 and 31 are allowed.

Replacement sheets for Figures 1-7, 9, 11, 13-16, 18-25 are included herewith. The replacement sheets include the freehand corrections previously submitted. No new matter is entered.

Claim 32 is amended herein to clarify the claimed features. The amendment is based on, for example, Fig. 1 and is similar to a limitation recited in Claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted the amendment should be entered and does not bring to a “new issue” because a similar feature is recited in Claim 1.

Claims 1-8, 10-11, 23-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as reciting subject matter not described in the specification.

As discussed with the Examiner during a telephone call, the previously amended dynamic routing table, in claims 1 and 23 to include “which is not changed by a change of network topology” should have been added to the static routing table limitation instead of a dynamic routing table limitation. The limitation was inadvertently added to the dynamic routing table. This has been corrected herein by adding the limitation to the static routing table.

Claim 32 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Eriksson et al. (US 6,243,384).

Applicant’s claim 32 includes, with respect to forwarding packets, a packet route selected by a first routing unit is used earlier than a packet route selected by a second routing unit, and the packet route selected by the second routing unit is used when a failure of the packet route

selected by the first routing unit occurs.


In contrast Eriksson et al. fail to teach or suggest such a feature. For example Eriksson et al. fail to mention that the packet route selected by the second routing unit is used when a failure of the packet route selected by the first routing unit occurs.

For at least the foregoing reasons it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 32 should be withdrawn. In addition the amendment should be entered since the added features were previously considered.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian S. Myers
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-8703
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987
Docket No.: FUJY 18.257 (100794-11600)
BSM:rm